# EXHIBIT 3

```
1
             IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2
             FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
3
                      WACO DIVISION
4
      - - - - - - - - x
5
    WSOU INVESTMENTS, LLC :
6
    D/B/A BRAZOS
7
    LICENSING AND : Case No.
                  : 6:20-cv-00980-ADA
8
    DEVELOPMENT,
9
           Plaintiff, :
10
       V.
11
    CANON, INC.,
12
           Defendant. :
13
      - - - - - - - - x
14
15
        REMOTELY CONDUCTED VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF
16
                      ZHI DING, PHD
17
                Tuesday, October 12, 2021
18
                      10:05 A.M. CST
19
20
     Job No.: 402078
21
     Pages: 1 - 123
22
     Reported By: Karisa Ekenseair, CCR RPR
23
24
25
```

Deposition of ZHI DING, PHD, conducted via Zoom videoconference. Pursuant to notice, before Karisa J. Ekenseair, Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the States of Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Illinois; National Registered Professional Reporter, Notary Public in and for the State of Arkansas. 

3

1 APPEARANCES 2 ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF (VIA ZOOM): 3 HERSHY STERN, ESQUIRE 4 JAYITA GUHANIYOGI, ESQUIRE 5 KASOWITZ, BENSON, TORRES LLP 6 1633 BROADWAY 7 NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019 8 212-506-1917 9 HSTERN@KASOWITZ.COM 10 11 ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT (VIA ZOOM): 12 RICHARD MARTINELLI, ESQUIRE 13 ORRICK LAW FIRM 14 51 WEST 52ND STREET 15 NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019 16 212-506-3702 17 RMARTINELLI@ORRICK.COM 18 19 20 ALSO PRESENT: 21 WILL FREBURGER, REMOTE TECHNICIAN 22 JEREMY DINEEN, VIDEOGRAPHER 23 24 25

1 O F TABLE CONTENTS 2 PAGE 3 STYLE AND NUMBER..... 4 APPEARANCES..... 3 5 6 ZHI DING, PHD WITNESS: 7 EXAMINATION BY MR. STERN...... 8 9 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE..... 123 10 11 12 **EXHIBITS** 13 NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE 14 1 CURRICULUM VITAE.....14 15 2 DECLARATION OF DR. ZHI DING IN 21 16 SUPPORT OF CANON'S PROPOSED 17 CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS..... 18 3 '346 PATENT.....47 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

> PLANET DEPOS 888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

5

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Here begins Disc Number 3 1 in the videotaped deposition of Zhi Ding, PhD in 10:05:12 10:05:16 the matter of WSOU Investments, LLD DBA Brazos 10:05:24 Licensing and Development, v. Canon, Inc., in the 6 10:05:27 U.S. District Court for the Western District of 10:05:31 7 Texas, Waco Division, Case Number 8 6:20-CV-00980-ADA. 10:05:36 9 10:05:37 Today's date is October 12th, 2021. Time 10 10:05:42 on the video manufacture is 10:05 Central. The 10:05:47 11 videographer today is Jeremy Dineen representing 10:05:50 12 Planet Depos. This video deposition is taking 13 10:05:52 place remotely. Would counsel please voice 10:05:55 14 identify themselves and state whom they represent? 15 MR. STERN: Sure. Good morning. This is 16 Hershy Stern form Kasowitz, Benson, Torres for 17 WSOU Investments, Plaintiffs. With me is Jayita 18 Guhaniyogi, also from Kasowitz, Benson, Torres and 19 as well for Plaintiff WSOU Investments. 20 MR. MARTINELLI: And this is Richard 10:06:22 21 Martinelli from Orrick on behalf of Canon, Inc. 22 10:06:22 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The court reporter 2.3 today is Karisa Ekenseair representing Planet 10:06:23 10:06:26 24 Depos. Would the reporter please swear in the 25 10:06:28 witness?

1	THE REPORTER: I have a short stipulation.	10:06:29
2	Will counsel please stipulate that in lieu	
3	of formally swearing in the witness, the reporter	
4	will instead ask the witness to acknowledge that	
5	their testimony will be true under penalties of	
6	perjuries, that counsel will not object to the	
7	admissibility of the transcript based on	
8	proceeding in this way and that the witness has	
9	verified that they are, in fact, Zhi Ding,	
10	beginning with the noticing attorney, please?	
11	MR. STERN: Agreed.	10:06:54
12	MR. MARTINELLI: And also agreed.	10:06:55
13	Zhi Ding, PhD	10:06:58
14	of lawful age, being first duly sworn, deposes and	10:06:58
15	says in reply to the questions propounded as	10:06:58
16	follows:	10:06:58
17	EXAMINATION	10:07:11
18	BY MR. STERN:	10:07:11
19	Q Good morning, Dr. Ding.	10:07:16
20	A Good morning.	10:07:18
21	Q Okay. So thank you. So we're doing	10:07:20
22	this deposition by remote. Have you given	10:07:25
23	deposition testimony remote, whatever means that	10:07:30
24	may be, Zoom or otherwise?	10:07:33
25	A No. I have not.	10:07:35

1	5
_	

1	we actually think about if we can just stay	11:20:00
2	with what was described in the patents.	11:20:05
3	If we go to the instead of page 11, if	11:20:10
4	we can move on to page 13, all right. So on	11:20:13
5	page 13, one can see that there is in the	11:20:18
6	bottom are the speech frame. So that's speech	11:20:22
7	frame has a total of eight hops, eight hops. Each	11:20:25
8	of the hop is marked by a column.	11:20:33
9	So we can see that during that	11:20:38
10	particular during that eight hops, you are	11:20:41
11	hopping from F3 to F1 to F4 and then F0 and F4 and	11:20:44
12	F4 again and so forth.	11:20:51
13	So when you finish this entire speech	11:20:53
14	frame, you have a you have eight hops, and that	11:20:56
15	forms one period T. And the idea of this	11:21:01
16	particular pattern says, if you look at it, there	11:21:06
17	are three yellow dashed arrows pointing to F4.	11:21:10
18	That meant that even though you had eight	11:21:15
19	frequencies to hop to but you didn't use all of	11:21:18
20	them in this particular case because the frequency	11:21:21
21	are select frequencies are selected	11:21:27
22	pseudorandomly, so accidentally you end up hitting	11:21:30
23	F4 three times.	11:21:33
24	And it would be it would be nicer if we	11:21:34
25	don't do that and the invention attempts to	11:21:36

46	_	

1	provide an algorithm or provide a method so that	11:21:41
2	you can achieve more diversified frequency hopping	11:21:45
3	without having to repeat certain frequencies in a	11:21:51
4	period of T.	11:21:56
5	Q So in that example on page 13, which is	11:22:01
6	from Figure 1 of the '346 patent; is that correct?	11:22:05
7	A It is from Figure 1 of the '346 patent	11:22:08
8	marked as a prior art, which	11:22:15
9	Q Okay.	11:22:16
10	A which was Figure 4 sorry, Figure 1.	11:22:17
11	Q So in this example, it's your view that	11:22:20
12	time period T is eight hops?	11:22:29
13	A Yes. In this example, the time period T	11:22:31
14	would be eight hops. That spans the entire speech	11:22:38
15	frame. That's that's where you would like	11:22:44
16	to you would like to provide more diversified	11:22:46
17	set of frequency hopping. And the solution was	11:22:50
18	provided by the '346 patent on the very next page.	11:22:52
19	That's actually Figure 3.	11:22:59
20	There, over that in same speech frame,	11:23:07
21	you have accomplished the use of all eight	11:23:10
22	differences, no repeat whatsoever. With these	11:23:14
23	two you one of ordinary skill in the art would	11:23:22
24	have understood what the problems were and what	11:23:26
25	the solution is.	11:23:33
		I

47

1 11:23:38 Q All right. So Dr. Ding, just to make 11:23:43 2 clear, between Figure 1 and Figure 3, your 3 11:23:47 understanding is that time period T is defined as 11:23:49 4 eight hops; is that correct? 5 11:23:51 A Yes. 6 11:23:53 Q And is time period T defined as eight hops 7 11:23:58 within the entirety of all the figures in the 8 11:24:01 patent? 9 11:24:01 A I'm sorry, not -- not the entirety of the 10 11:24:07 patent, but with specific examples explaining the 11:24:15 11 problem and the solution. The examples I have 11:24:18 12 cited from the patent indicate that the period is 13 11:24:21 T -- period T is eight. And in some examples, 11:24:27 14 they talk about the period T is actually four. 11:24:31 1.5 Q All right. 16 11:24:34 MR. STERN: So Will, can we pull up Tab 6 11:24:39 17 on to the screen and -- and Dr. Ding, Tab Number 6 11:24:46 18 next to you as well, and that's the '346 patent. 19 11:24:51 For the record, we're going to identify Exhibit 20 11:24:54 Ding 3 as U.S. Patent Number 7054346 and 11:25:06 21 colloquially refer to it as the '346 patent. 22 11:25:16 (Exhibit Number 3 marked for identification.) 2.3 Q Dr. Ding, do you have the '346 patent in 11:25:21 11:25:23 24 front of vou? 25 11:25:24 A Yes, I do.

5	Λ
J	v

1	actually have a diversified set, a diversified set	11:28:39
2	of frequencies to hop over. You would try	11:28:45
3	to to avoid repeats within T, okay, to the	11:28:48
4	extent possible.	11:28:53
5	So in that case, if your T is too if	11:28:54
6	your T is too large and it you only have N	11:28:59
7	frequencies, but your T is greater than N, then	11:29:06
8	any reasonable person, not even POSITA, but any	11:29:10
9	reasonable person would have understood that you	11:29:14
10	will have repeats because you get to select only	11:29:17
11	from N frequencies and you have more than N places	11:29:20
12	to put them.	11:29:24
13	So something will be repeated. And for	11:29:25
14	that reason, it is really a genuine and accurate	11:29:28
15	statement to limit T to an integer, right, that is	11:29:36
16	no greater than N in order to be consistent with	11:29:41
17	the invention that no repeats would take place	11:29:45
18	within a period of time T.	11:29:49
19	Q So you're saying T can be in your	11:29:52
20	definition, time period T can be equal to can	11:29:59
21	only be strike that.	11:30:03
22	It's your understanding as a POSITA that	11:30:05
23	time period the term "time period T" as used in	11:30:10
24	the claim can only be construed as equal to or	11:30:17
25	less than the N number of frequencies; is that	11:30:21

51

1 11:30:26 correct? 2 11:30:26 A That's correct in the -- in light of the 3 patent -- the entire patent specification, the 11:30:31 11:30:35 4 examples, okay, and the implementation process I 11:30:44 have explained, as well the file history, that is 6 11:30:46 the most reasonable and inclusive claim 7 11:30:54 construction one can give to T. 8 11:30:58 T cannot be anything without considering 9 11:31:01 how many frequencies there are that you can hop 10 11:31:04 over. In other words, N. N is a number. How 11:31:08 11 many frequencies are there to hop over. 11:31:14 12 Q Dr. Ding, is there anywhere in the patent 13 11:31:23 other than the example, are there words in the 11:31:25 14 patent that define the term "time period T" as 11:31:31 15 being limited to or equal to the -- the N number 16 11:31:36 of frequencies? 11:31:37 17 A Within -- within -- within the patent 11:31:47 18 itself, it -- the patent does not explicitly say 19 11:31:58 so in the patent specification that T is limited 20 11:32:00 to N or to N or smaller. What I have stated was 21 that the patentee has presented to the patent 11:32:05 11:32:11 22 examiner that you -- that your entire invention is 2.3 to prevent repeats within T. 11:32:20 24 11:32:27 For that reason, in -- if -- if for this 25 11:32:30 particular algorithm to be feasible, you cannot

	Transcript of Zin Bing, The	
ı	Conducted on October 12, 2021 52	1
1	have T greater than N and still avoid repeats of	11:32:35
2	prior prior selected frequencies.	11:32:42
3	Q Okay. So your construction of time period	11:33:00
4	T is based upon what the patentee says to the	11:33:06
5	patent examiner, correct?	11:33:13
6	A It's not just based on what patentee said	11:33:14
7	to patent examiner. A person of ordinary skill in	11:33:19
8	the art would read a patent, look at the example,	11:33:22
9	the example describes that there's a T in a Figure	11:33:25
10	1. There's T in Figure 3. And the patent	11:33:30
11	explains that there are incentives to provide a	11:33:34
12	mechanism that prior-selected frequencies should	11:33:39
13	not be repeated again for the sole purposes of	11:33:47
14	providing enough frequency diversity in the course	11:33:51
15	of an interleading depth of a speech frame.	11:33:54
16	So N so that already gave you enough	11:33:59
17	knowledge and understanding about what the patent	11:34:06
18	is about, is to prevent repeats. And then a	11:34:08
19	well-trained person or a commonsense person would	11:34:13
20	think like the following: How many frequencies do	11:34:17
21	you have to hop over? If I only have four	11:34:21
22	frequencies to hop over, then if you make T to be	11:34:24
23	8 or 12, you will have repeats regardless of	11:34:28
24	whether it is stated explicitly in the patent or	11:34:32
25	not.	11:34:36

5	1
J	7

1	hopping which is no longer than the amount of time	11:36:40
2	it would take to use each channel available for	11:36:42
3	frequency hopping once'."	11:36:47
4	Do you see that?	11:36:50
5	A Yes.	11:36:51
6	Q And that's your opinion of what the time	11:36:51
7	period T term should mean?	11:36:56
8	A That would be the limit. That would be	11:37:01
9	the constraint on the time period T. Yes.	11:37:04
10	Q Okay. And your construction is, is it	11:37:10
11	anywhere it's not anywhere in the specification	11:37:17
12	that it says that time period T is limited to a	11:37:19
13	preset amount of time for one cycle of frequency	11:37:22
14	hopping, which is no longer than the amount of	11:37:25
15	time it would take to use each channel available	11:37:28
16	for frequency hopping once, correct?	11:37:31
17	A I'm sorry, Mr. Stern. I'm a bit confused.	11:37:34
18	What was the question again?	11:37:40
19	Q Sure. You included your proposed	11:37:41
20	construction of the term time period T terms in	11:37:44
21	paragraph 56, correct?	11:37:48
22	A The term of construction is on page 2.	11:37:50
23	Q I'm looking at paragraph 56.	11:37:57
24	A Okay.	11:38:00
25	Q That's on page 21.	11:38:01

55

1 11:38:06 A Yes. 2 11:38:07 Q Okay. So on page 21, paragraph 56, you 3 write, "In summary, it is my opinion that a POSITA 11:38:10 11:38:15 would have understood the time period T terms to 11:38:18 mean 'a preset amount of time for one cycle of 6 11:38:24 frequency hopping which is no longer than the 7 11:38:28 amount of time it would take to use each channel 8 11:38:34 available for frequency hopping once'." 9 11:38:37 Is that -- that's your construction? 10 11:38:38 A Yes. And that's consistent, as I said 11:38:41 11 more formally -- with a more formal presentation 11:38:45 12 on page 2. Q I understand that. My question to you is: 1.3 11:38:48 11:38:52 14 That construction in those exact words, are there 11:38:55 15 found anywhere within the -- within the patent 11:38:58 16 specification? 11:39:04 17 A The answer is no. The claim 11:39:10 18 construction -- in my understanding of what claim 19 11:39:12 construction is, that the process needs a person 20 11:39:17 to read the entirety -- the totality of the 11:39:22 21 information that's available to the person and 11:39:28 22 view that at the -- at the time of the invention. 2.3 So this is not literally stated in the 11:39:32 11:39:38 24 patent '346 itself. But it is entirely consistent 25 11:39:46 and it captures what the -- what the '346 patent

	Conducted on October 12, 2021 56	_
1	attempt to accomplish.	11:39:52
2	Q Understood.	11:39:57
3	A And also, I'm sorry, to this is very	11:40:01
4	broad construction already. We're not	11:40:06
5	limiting I mean, I'm not limiting T to be a	11:40:09
6	number, 8 or 16 or so forth. I think giving this	11:40:12
7	kind of broader construction to avoid repeats of	11:40:17
8	frequency selection, right, is in this not just	11:40:22
9	literally, but also in the spirit of '346	11:40:28
10	invention.	11:40:32
11	Q Okay. It's your understanding that while	11:40:34
12		11:40:42
13	the patentee did not expressly state so, that they	11:40:49
	intended to limit time period T to be equal to or	
14	less than the number of frequencies that could be	11:40:55
15	used for hopping?	11:40:58
16	MR. MARTINELLI: Objection. Form.	11:41:00
17	Q Correct?	11:41:01
18	A Not quite. It's the amount of time it	11:41:02
19	would take for you to for you if you were to	11:41:05
20	hop over the entire selection of available	11:41:11
21	frequencies, the time	11:41:14
22	Q How so if there were eight frequencies,	11:41:17
23	how would you determine the time based upon the	11:41:21
24	eight frequencies?	11:41:24
25	A Well, one would first determine how much	11:41:26
		I

1	time it takes to complete one hop. And then	11:41:30
2	there if there are eight frequency total, it	11:41:36
3	would be eight times the amount of time it takes	11:41:38
4	to complete one hop and then the capital T, the T	11:41:41
5	variable would be limited to the amount of time	11:41:46
6	that is no longer than eight multiplied the	11:41:52
7	hopping I'm sorry, eight times the time it	11:42:00
8	takes for one hop to complete.	11:42:06
9	So if we just say one hop takes TH, then	11:42:08
10	there will be eight eight times TH is the	11:42:14
11	amount of time that one would limit the time	11:42:19
12	period T to.	11:42:23
13	Q Does it state anywhere in the patent how	11:42:24
14	long it would take to conduct one hop?	11:42:32
15	A No. I don't believe so. I don't but	11:42:34
16	it is stated it is explicitly explained in the	11:42:42
17	patent, if we would like to, you one would	11:42:48
18	look go back to exhibit I think you called	11:42:50
19	Exhibit 1 I beg your pardon, the patent '346	11:42:55
20	patent.	11:42:59
21	And one would look at Figure 1, Figure 3,	11:42:59
22	and to understand that there is a unit of time	11:43:02
23	that would take for one to complete one hop. If	11:43:09
24	we could go back and look at Figure 1 or Figure 3	11:43:13
25	of the exhibit, you will see that there is a	11:43:20

5	0
J	0

		i
1	defined frequency hopping time. So per hop, you	11:43:26
2	take equal amount of time for each hop.	11:43:32
3	So very often as we as the cliche says,	11:43:43
4	a picture is worth a thousand words. So	11:43:46
5	literally, it doesn't say so, but a person of	11:43:49
6	skill in the art looking at the picture would	11:43:52
7	understood would have understood that the	11:43:55
8	frequency hopping time per hop is limited to a	11:43:59
9	particular unit and they're all equal.	11:44:03
10	Q Dr Dr. Ding, could you give us is	11:44:07
11	Bluetooth an example that uses a frequency-hopping	11:44:14
12	algorithm?	11:44:17
13	A I beg your pardon? Is Bluetooth an	11:44:18
14	example of what? Sorry.	11:44:21
15	Q That uses a frequency-hopping protocol?	11:44:22
16	A Bluetooth does use frequency hopping. It	11:44:24
17	does. Yes.	11:44:28
18	Q And how much spectrum does it use?	11:44:29
19	A I don't recall.	11:44:35
20	MR. MARTINELLI: Form.	11:44:36
21	THE WITNESS: At this moment. We can I	11:44:37
22	can look at the standard and find out, but suffice	11:44:41
23	to say, if I if I remember correctly, there are	11:44:46
24	dozens of frequencies you need to hop over. I	11:44:49
25	think the total number is about 72. That's	11:44:53
		1

_	$\cap$	
7	ч	

1	from my recollection, but.	11:44:57
2	Q Does	11:45:00
3	A If you need me to find out, I can find out	11:45:00
4	and tell you that.	11:45:03
5	Q Well, I'm 72 sounds about right to me.	11:45:04
6	We can go with that for these purposes.	11:45:08
7	A Okay.	11:45:12
8	Q Does does the Bluetooth standard in the	11:45:12
9	code define a time period, as in time period T?	11:45:15
10	MR. MARTINELLI: Objection. Form.	11:45:22
11	Outside the scope.	11:45:23
12	THE WITNESS: Does Bluetooth specify a	11:45:24
13	time period T? I don't know. I don't I don't	11:45:32
14	know whether Bluetooth try to develop an algorithm	11:45:37
15	for which frequency repeat would not take place or	11:45:45
16	not. I don't recall that.	11:45:48
17	Q Does every frequency-hopping algorithm	11:45:49
18	define a time period T?	11:45:56
19	MR. MARTINELLI: Objection. Form.	11:46:01
20	THE WITNESS: Not necessarily. It the	11:46:02
21	time T and N and F and all those variables are	11:46:08
22	specific to the algorithm the algorithm or the	11:46:14
23	objective. So in the context in the framework of	11:46:20
24	'346, these variables are explicitly sped up, even	11:46:25
25	if the claims themselves.	11:46:32

60

1 11:46:37 Q Okay. 2 11:46:45 MR. STERN: Richard, can we take a short 11:46:48 3 break? I apologize. I just have to run out for a 11:46:51 4 second. 11:46:51 MR. MARTINELLI: No problem. 6 11:46:52 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the 7 11:46:56 record at 11:46. 8 11:47:00 (A short break was had.) 9 11:57:37 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the 10 11:57:42 record at 11:57. BY MR. STERN: 11:57:46 11 11:57:49 12 Q Okay. All right. Dr. Ding, I believe a 13 11:58:04 couple seconds right before we took a break, you 11:58:08 14 stated that you don't believe that there's a time 11:58:12 15 period T that defines inside of the Bluetooth 16 11:58:19 frequency-hopping protocol; is that -- is that 11:58:26 17 fair? 11:58:26 18 A It's not totally true because one could 19 11:58:31 argue that there's a T based somewhere. But yeah, 20 11:58:37 within the Bluetooth protocol itself it does 21 have -- the Bluetooth standard itself does not 11:58:40 11:58:44 22 define a T as required in the patent '346. 2.3 Q Right. So I'm not even talking about in 11:58:54 24 11:58:57 reference to the '346 patent. I'm just asking 25 11:59:00 generally, the Bluetooth protocol for frequency

64 1 12:03:56 So if -- if one looks at the totality of 2 12:04:00 the whole invention and the back and forth in file 12:04:03 3 history, I reach the conclusion that for -- the 12:04:07 4 patent is only meaningful, the algorithm is only 12:04:12 5 meaningful when you are preventing repeats over a 6 12:04:18 time period of T. 7 12:04:20 There are certain disclaimers in there one 8 12:04:22 can take out, but it's never supported -- it's not 9 12:04:24 supported by any evidence that claim '346 allows 10 12:04:29 repeat. 12:04:36 11 Q You just said there are certain 12:04:39 12 disclaimers to take out. What did you mean by 13 t.hat.? 12:04:42 12:04:42 14 A I think in Dr. Cooklev's declaration, he 12:04:49 15 opined that the patentee only stated that their 12:04:56 16 goal is to minimize frequency repeats in hopping, 12:05:00 17 and that's -- that's the kind of the equivocation 12:05:05 18 that I can see. 19 12:05:07 However, as I said, the patent 20 12:05:11 specification '346 never provide example other 12:05:17 21 than preventing repeats. There's no example in 22 12:05:20 '346 that says, oh, there's this other way of 2.3 allowing repeats. 12:05:23 12:05:25 24 Q Okay. So just so I'm clear on your

testimony, you agree that the patent -- the '346

12:05:30

65 1 12:05:34 patent specification states that 2 12:05:41 you -- you -- that the invention is intended to 3 12:05:42 minimize repeats, therefore allowing some 12:05:46 repeating; however, the examples themselves 12:05:50 5 prevent repeats. Is that correct? 6 12:05:53 MR. MARTINELLI: Objection. Form. 12:05:53 7 THE WITNESS: No. It's not correct. The 8 12:06:00 patentee explicitly stated they are trying to 9 12:06:03 avoid repeats. And it is my opinion that they 10 12:06:07 provided algorithms and embodiment that 12:06:10 11 accomplishes that. And they also presented to the 12:06:13 12 patent examiner, and that was -- that is the 13 invention of '346. And it is agreed by the 12:06:14 12:06:18 14 examiner when they -- when the patent was issued. 12:06:24 15 I think they can be sentences here and there that 12:06:29 16 Dr. Cooklev relied on to argue otherwise, but I 12:06:34 17 disagree. 12:06:34 18 O But there are sentences that state that 19 12:06:39 the invention was intended to minimize or reduce 12:06:42 20 repeats; is that correct? 12:06:45 21 A There are sentences that -- maybe one or 12:06:50 22 two sentences that says this particular algorithm 2.3 would minimize and reduce repeats. Naturally when 12:06:53 12:06:59 24 there's no repeats, you minimize it. There's no

> PLANET DEPOS 888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

repeats, you reduce it. So that -- that kind

12:07:03

1	of statement does not broaden the invention. It	12:07:05
2	only says what the invention is able to accomplish	12:07:09
3	by preventing repeats in frequency hopping.	12:07:14
4	Q Understood. Your opinion is that the	12:07:19
5	invention requires absolutely no repeats of use of	12:07:24
6	frequencies during the entirety of time period T,	12:07:31
7	correct?	12:07:39
8	A That's my that's my opinion for	12:07:39
9	based on the file history. That's what's	12:07:43
10	presented by the patentee and that's what's	12:07:46
11	explained by the examiner in allowing this patent.	12:07:50
12	Q Okay. Now, if time period T is eight	12:07:56
13	hops, the entire time period T is eight hops,	12:08:05
14	right? I'm sorry, strike that.	12:08:11
15	If if there are only eight frequencies	12:08:13
16	that could be used, what is time period T?	12:08:18
17	A An honest and intellectually accurate	12:08:21
18	construction is that period T needs to be shorter	12:08:30
19	than eight frequencies to prevent repeats. So	12:08:33
20	we're not saying it must be eight. It could be	12:08:40
21	four or six.	12:08:43
22	Q So could be anywhere between zero and	12:08:46
23	eight?	12:08:50
24	A No. Zero wouldn't be a hopping period.	12:08:52
25	One wouldn't be frequency hopping because you're	12:08:57
		ī

67

1 12:09:01 just repeating every time, so it's just one 2 12:09:04 frequency. I'm not even sure two makes sense in 3 12:09:09 the context of this invention. But it needs to be 12:09:12 4 something, you know, closer to four or between 12:09:17 5 four and eight would be reasonable in this 6 12:09:20 particular example. 12:09:22 7 Q Okay. So -- so time period T can be up to 8 12:09:27 eight? 9 12:09:29 A Correct. In --10 12:09:31 Q Eight hops? 12:09:32 11 A In the example -- in your example where 12:09:36 12 there are only eight frequencies to select from. 1.3 12:09:38 Q Okay. So let's call time period T equals 12:09:44 14 eight hops; is that correct? Is that a fair 12:09:46 15 example to you? 12:09:48 16 A Yes. It is. 12:09:50 17 Okay. And the entire -- you -- how do you define the entirety of time period T? 12:09:54 18 19 12:10:00 A I beg pardon, you -- you appear to say 20 12:10:03 that if we have eight frequencies as available 12:10:08 21 frequency to hop over, then T -- let's take the 22 12:10:14 example of T equal to eight. 2.3 And I agree that will be an example and 12:10:16 12:10:18 24 that would fit with the spirit and the precise 25 12:10:25 examples in '346. And it also is consistent with

68

1 12:10:30 the -- the proposed claim construction by Canon. 12:10:36 2 I agree with that, and so we can use that example 12:10:39 3 for the purpose of illustration. 12:10:42 4 Q Okay. Did you just say that -- is that 12:10:45 5 Canon's claim construction? Did I understand that 6 12:10:48 correct? 7 12:10:51 A I'm sorry, it's my -- it's the 8 12:10:54 construction I am providing in my declaration. 9 12:11:01 Q Did you develop that claim construction? 10 12:11:03 A Sorry? 12:11:03 11 Q Did you -- did you develop that claim 12:11:09 12 construction? 13 12:11:09 A Yes. 12:11:11 14 Q Okay. Okay. So time period T equals 12:11:15 15 eight hops. In that example, the entirety of time 16 12:11:24 period T is eight hops, correct? 12:11:26 17 A We're using that as example. Is that 12:11:29 18 right? Okay. I affirm we're using this as 19 12:11:34 example. I'm waiting for what happens with this 20 12:11:36 example. 12:11:37 21 Q So with that example, what -- what would 12:11:39 22 you understand to be a portion of time period T? 2.3 How would you define a -- the word a "portion" of 12:11:44 24 12:11:47 time period T? 25 12:11:48 A I see. Okay. That's a -- this is

		1
1	actually perfect if for us to review what '346	12:11:52
2	talked about.	12:11:56
3	So in this in this particular example,	12:11:57
4	there would be a moment with so let's say	12:12:01
5	for four hops has taken place. 1, 2, 3, 4, and	12:12:07
6	now for the remainder of T, we need to look at how	12:12:11
7	to restrict the selection of the frequency such	12:12:19
8	that the the frequency that frequencies that	12:12:22
9	have been selected in the previous four would not	12:12:27
10	be repeated for the remainder of T. That's eight.	12:12:31
11	So you have four hops. We possibly have	12:12:35
12	used eight four frequencies in those four hops.	12:12:40
13	And we'd like to prevent any one of the four hops	12:12:43
14	from reappearing again from being re-selected	12:12:46
15	again in the remaining four hops.	12:12:50
16	So at this particular moment in time, I	12:12:54
17	would view a portion of time, okay, a portion of T	12:12:59
18	to be either the entirety of the four period,	12:13:03
19	okay, or just the next one. So for the next one,	12:13:08
20	I need to limit. I need to limit my frequency	12:13:12
21	selection to the other four frequencies that have	12:13:17
22	not been selected thus far.	12:13:21
23	So a portion of time is from the moment	12:13:23
24	that you started to apply constraint on the	12:13:28
25	frequency-hopping set available for your	12:13:35
		4

83						
	1	2		3	3	
		_	•	J	J	•
	1	2	:	3	4	:
	1	2	:	3	4	:
	1	2	:	3	4	:
	1	2	:	3	4	:
	1	2	:	3	4	:
	1	2	:	3	4	:
	1	2	:	3	4	:
	1	2	:	3	4	:
	1	2	:	3	4	:
	1	2	:	3	4	:
	1	2	:	3	4	:
	1	2	:	3	4	:
	1	2	:	3	4	:
	1	2	:	3	4	:
	1	2	:	3	4	:

1	nanticular nantion of time? The and the anguer	12:33:55
	particular portion of time? The and the answer	
2	is you you can eliminate frequencies from being	12:34:00
3	used. You can design such algorithm.	12:34:08
4	For what purpose is the key. The purpose	12:34:10
5	of minimizing or reducing frequency repeat will be	12:34:12
6	defeated if I were to do that.	12:34:19
7	Q No. I think the purpose of minimizing and	12:34:23
8	reducing the frequency being repeated would be	12:34:26
9	met. Elimination would be would not occur,	12:34:31
10	correct?	12:34:34
11	MR. MARTINELLI: Objection. Form.	12:34:34
12	THE WITNESS: No. Not if you were talking	12:34:35
13	about the entirety of the T. Right. If the	12:34:37
14	entirety of the communication period because if	12:34:41
15	you're doing the entire communication period, then	12:34:44
16	you would like to have as many frequency as	12:34:47
17	possible to hop in order to prevent the	12:34:50
18	possibility of repeats, or to minimize the number	12:34:55
19	of repeats.	12:34:58
20	But barring some frequencies from being	12:34:59
21	selected, you have you have now reduced the	12:35:03
22	number of frequencies you could use. And the	12:35:05
23	outcome would necessarily be more repeats would	12:35:09
24	have to take place. So there will be there	12:35:13
25	will be fewer frequency because there will be	12:35:17

84

1 12:35:22 fewer frequencies to select from, and then the 2 12:35:29 frequency diversity will suffer as a result of 3 12:35:31 that. 12:35:31 Q Understood. So Dr. Ding, let's -- let's 12:35:33 5 go back to the example where two devices -- you 6 12:35:36 could develop a program where two devices are 12:35:41 7 communicating where the frequency hopping is 8 12:35:43 occurring between those two devices as long as 9 12:35:47 data is being communicated, correct? 10 12:35:49 A I can. 12:35:49 11 Okay. Now, let's say there are five 12:35:53 12 frequency -- let's say that data is being 13 12:35:55 communicated over a ten-minute period of time. 12:36:03 14 Do you understand that? 12:36:04 15 A Okay. 16 12:36:05 MR. MARTINELLI: I'm sorry, I don't mean 12:36:07 17 to interrupt. Whatever you said after "ten", I 12:36:12 18 didn't catch that. 19 12:36:12 MR. STERN: Sorry. Ten-minute period of 12:36:14 20 time. 12:36:15 21 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay. Thank you. 22 12:36:15 O So two -- strike that. 2.3 Dr. Ding, you agree that you could develop 12:36:19 12:36:23 24 a -- a communication protocol where frequency 25 12:36:31 hopping is occurring during the entirety of data

85

1 12:36:33 communication between two devices, correct? 2 12:36:36 A Yes. 3 12:36:37 Q And let's assume that the entirety of that 12:36:41 4 data communication between those two devices is 12:36:45 ten minutes. 6 12:36:46 A Okay. 12:36:46 7 Q Do you understand that? 8 12:36:47 A Okay. 12:36:48 9 Q Now, let's say there are five frequencies 10 12:36:56 that could be used. Each one -- each hop takes a 12:36:59 11 minute. 12:36:59 12 A Okav. 1.3 12:36:59 Q Okay. That means could you -- if 12:37:07 14 Frequency Number 1 is being used during Minute 15 12:37:11 Number 1 --12:37:12 16 A Okav. 12:37:12 17 Q -- could you write code that stops 12:37:16 18 Frequency Number 1 from being used during Minute 19 12:37:20 Number 2; yes or no? 20 12:37:25 A If I have previously used Number 1, can I 21 write a code to say don't use Frequency Number 1 12:37:32 22 12:37:36 again/. 2.3 Q Not again. During Minute Number 2? 12:37:36 12:37:39 24 A Minute Number 2. Yes. Here -- you can. 25 12:37:45 You use Number 1 and you're not going to use

ı	Conducted on October 12, 2021	1
1	Number 1 again, yeah. Yes.	12:37:48
2	Q Okay. Could you develop code where you	12:37:50
3	use Frequency Number 1 during Minute Number 1	12:37:52
4	A Yes.	12:37:56
5	Q but not not during Minute Number 2,	12:37:56
6	but then again at some portion between 3 and 10?	12:37:59
7	A What exactly I'm sorry, the requirement	12:38:05
8	is for me to write a code that says in Slot Number	12:38:09
9	1, use Frequency 1, but not to use that in Slot	12:38:14
10	Number 2. And then what happened later?	12:38:17
11	Q But then make it available in Slots Number	12:38:20
12	3 through 10.	12:38:23
13	A Make it available for Slot 3 and 10?	12:38:24
14	Q 3 through 10. Any slot in 3 through 10, I	12:38:30
15	want to make it available.	12:38:36
16	A It really depends. I didn't do have	12:38:37
17	not done this analysis. It really has to do with	12:38:38
18	what exactly the point is. So if there are only	12:38:41
19	two frequencies you're picking from, F1 and F2,	12:38:44
20	then you have no choice but to pick from one of	12:38:49
21	the two.	12:38:52
22	So you go on and so, eventually, if I say	12:38:52
23	no, after 1 and 2 you you get you get to go	12:38:56
24	back to F1 again, so yes, you can always do that.	12:39:01
25	So are there just two frequencies then?	12:39:06

ı	Conducted on October 12, 2021 87	' 1
1	Q No. There were five frequencies.	12:39:11
2	A Okay. They were five frequencies. Okay.	12:39:13
3	So your question is if you repeat if you	12:39:16
4	could repeat question if I understand your	12:39:18
5	question better, I can answer that. The question	12:39:21
6	is what? I'm sorry.	12:39:23
7	Q Of course. Sure. Sure. So you you	12:39:24
8	stated I just want to back this up to try to	12:39:28
9	make this a little clear.	12:39:31
10	You stated earlier that you can develop a	12:39:33
11	communication protocol that uses frequency hopping	12:39:36
12	during the entire period of communication,	12:39:39
13	correct?	12:39:40
14	A Okay. Yes. The ten the ten minutes	12:39:40
15	you talked about yes. Ten minutes.	12:39:43
16	Q Ten minutes. And each time slot, there	12:39:43
17	there are five hopping frequencies	12:39:46
18	A Okay. Five. Okay.	12:39:48
19	Q but each each each slot that	12:39:49
20	could be used, we're going to cut up the ten	12:39:52
21	minutes into ten slots.	12:39:56
22	A Okay.	12:39:57
23	Q Okay. So five frequencies, you use	12:39:58
24	Frequency Number 1 in Slot number 1?	12:40:01
25	A Yes.	12:40:05

0	0
0	0

1	Q Okay. And you could develop the code	12:40:05
2	where you use Frequency Number 1 in Slot Number 1,	12:40:09
3	prevented Frequency 1 from use being used in	12:40:12
4	Slot Number 2, but then again allow Frequency 1 to	12:40:15
5	be used between Slot Number 3 through 10.	12:40:19
6	You can develop that code, correct?	12:40:24
7	A I can write that code. For what purpose,	12:40:27
8	I don't know.	12:40:31
9	Q I understand. Thank you.	12:40:32
10	MR. STERN: Jeremy, how much time do we	12:40:38
11	have on the record?	12:40:40
12	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We currently have	12:40:41
13	2 hours 16 minutes on the record.	12:40:45
14	MR. STERN: Rich, can we take another	12:40:52
15	quick break? I apologize for that.	12:40:56
16	MR. MARTINELLI: Yeah. No worries.	12:41:00
17	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the	12:41:01
18	record at 12:40.	12:41:05
19	(A short break was had.)	12:41:07
20	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the	12:51:06
21	record at 12:51.	12:51:12
22	BY MR. STERN:	12:51:18
23	Q Dr. Ding, I want to move on from what	12:51:19
24	we've been discussing a little bit into some of	12:51:25
25	the other terms that you provided constructions	12:51:28
		1

89

1 12:51:33 for, if that's okay? 2 12:51:34 A Certainly. 3 Q Okay. So I want to look at on page 25 of 12:51:35 12:51:40 4 your declaration, paragraph 69, in particular. 5 12:51:50 MR. STERN: And Will, could you pull it up 6 on the screen? I think it might be easier for 12:51:54 7 12:51:57 everyone to look at. And that's Exhibit Ding 2, 8 12:52:03 Ding Exhibit 2. 9 12:52:12 REMOTE TECHNICIAN: Which section was it. 10 12:52:14 that you wanted on the screen? 12:52:15 11 MR. STERN: Paragraph 69 on page 25. 12:52:23 12 Okav. Perfect. 13 BY MR. STERN: 12:52:23 12:52:24 14 Q Dr. Ding, are you there on paragraph 69 on 12:52:27 15 page 25 of your declaration? 12:52:28 16 A Yes. 12:52:29 17 Q Great. Okay. So you provided opinions 12:52:36 18 with respect to the constructions for what are 19 12:52:42 colloquially known as the N terms as separately 12:52:44 20 for the F terms; is that correct? 12:52:52 21 A I'm sorry, what do you mean by 12:52:57 22 colloquially known as the --2.3 Q Sorry. There -- there are a group of 12:52:58 12:53:01 24 terms that relate to the N frequencies? 25 12:53:09

A Right. Within the patent -- within the

13:08:22 13:08:24

13:09:42

99

1 I -- I think it's exaggeration to -- to 2 say that they are ten minutes and you only hop 3 13:08:29 once per minute because that would be extremely 13:08:32 4 bad way of designing a system. 13:08:34 5 But you know, just for the sake of 6 13:08:37 argument, you can have ten minutes to look into --7 13:08:41 say, I'm going to look at ten minutes and I'll see 8 13:08:44 what -- what -- what example we can see, how to 9 13:08:50 define frequency selection over this period of ten 10 13:08:54 minutes. Yes. 13:08:55 11 Q Right. So a portion of time T in that 13:09:03 12 example, what would a portion of time T be? 13 13:09:06 MR. MARTINELLI: Objection. Form. 13:09:06 14 THE WITNESS: Hypothetical -- this -- this 13:09:11 15 is a hypothetical, and I don't know what --16 13:09:15 whether it has anything to do with the patent. 13:09:18 17 But in this hypothetical situation, if you 13:09:20 18 just come in and say, okay, a portion of time T, 19 13:09:24 tell me what a portion of time T is, it can be 20 13:09:27 anything. It can be a fraction of the hop too, or 13:09:32 21 it could be, you know, two-thirds of a hop period, 22 13:09:35 or one hop interval plus two-thirds. It can be a 2.3 portion. 13:09:40 13:09:41 24 I think -- but it would not have made

sense, unless when looking to the -- the entirety

1	of the claim language and the specification to	13:09:48
2	understand what exactly we are writing this	13:09:52
3	communication algorithm for.	13:09:57
4	Are we trying to accomplish anything or	13:09:59
5	are we just doing it for fun so that we can	13:10:01
6	prevent some frequency from being used again,	13:10:04
7	thereby increasing the chance of repeat.	13:10:08
8	Q Okay. So in that example, a portion of	13:10:11
9	time period T would be one minute or the use of	13:10:18
10	one frequency slot?	13:10:25
11	A Okay.	13:10:27
12	Q Correct?	13:10:27
13	A You yeah. You can pick one one	13:10:28
14	minute to be a one frequency hopping slot, which	13:10:33
15	is, as I indicated to you, Mr. Stern, is	13:10:37
16	completely it's a pathological example. It	13:10:40
17	doesn't you would never do that.	13:10:47
18	But again, for the sake of our example,	13:10:48
19	one can make that example, make it like that. It	13:10:50
20	would not have anything to do with the claim, nor	13:10:53
21	the patent.	13:10:56
22	Q Sure. But and that would and that	13:10:58
23	one minute or one frequency hopping slot, that	13:11:00
24	would be a portion of time period T, correct?	13:11:05
25	A To a layman. Yeah. It is a portion of	13:11:07
		Ī

1	time.	13:11:11
2	Q Okay. And in that example, the entirety	13:11:12
3	of time period T would equal ten because you have	13:11:15
4	ten slots, correct?	13:11:18
5	MR. MARTINELLI: Objection. Form.	13:11:19
6	THE WITNESS: I beg pardon. I don't	13:11:20
7	understand. Are we saying that the entirety is T,	13:11:22
8	or the entirety is the communication time? I'm	13:11:26
9	not totally certain.	13:11:29
10	Yeah. Because we understand that the	13:11:30
11	communication time are never prelimited. You	13:11:35
12	cannot say, look, I know a Ferrari, you know, the	13:11:39
13	length time is ten minutes. I don't think your	13:11:44
14	earpiece and your phone know how long you're going	13:11:47
15	to be connected to. It will connect as long as	13:11:52
16	the battery last.	13:11:56
17	Q So communication times are never	13:11:57
18	prelimited; is that correct?	13:12:06
19	A I wouldn't say it's never limited. They	13:12:08
20	are they always limit you. As I said, your	13:12:12
21	your battery time is I don't know how long your	13:12:16
22	earpiece battery time is. Mine is about, like,	13:12:19
23	three hours. And yeah, it's it's not going to	13:12:22
24	be more than three hours.	13:12:25
25	But also it depends on whether it's a	13:12:26
		Ī

1	communication, for example, between a submarine	13:12:29
2	and headquarter. And you will limit that	13:12:32
3	communication time to be short enough so that	13:12:35
4	the so as to evade any potential enemy	13:12:38
5	detection.	13:12:42
6	I would not I don't agree with your	13:12:43
7	statement that it's never limited. But is it	13:12:46
8	preset? Is it known? Mostly most of the time,	13:12:49
9	no. Sometimes, yes.	13:12:53
10	Q Okay. Okay. And then let's talk about	13:12:59
11	quickly on that same paragraph 69, the second	13:13:18
12	sentence down. You write you define, I guess,	13:13:33
13	what I would consider or I believe what can we	13:13:40
14	consider what F frequency terms; is that fair?	13:13:45
15	A Yes.	13:13:49
16	Q Okay. And you define the F frequency	13:13:49
17	terms to mean, for time period T, the number of	13:13:54
18	remaining frequencies available for frequency	13:13:57
19	hopping that have not been previously second	13:13:59
20	during that time period; is that correct?	13:14:03
21	A Yes.	13:14:05
22	Q And did the patentee use defined F	13:14:05
23	frequency terms in the patent in such a way as you	13:14:13
24	write here in your report in paragraph 69?	13:14:16
25	A I think I believe they did define F to	13:14:21

1	be a frequency, allowable frequency. I think I	13:14:27
2	think that's the term. But they are and they	13:14:31
3	are decremented in size.	13:14:36
4	So one typically would look at Figure 6 to	13:14:38
5	see that the and also Figure 5 to see that the	13:14:42
6	F is the number of frequency that you that one	13:14:47
7	is allowed to select which has not been previously	13:14:54
8	selected in frequency hopping.	13:14:58
9	Q Dr. Ding, I understand that you believe	13:15:02
10	that the examples you read the examples in that	13:15:06
11	way. However, the patentee in any words actually	13:15:14
12	define the F frequency terms such that they could	13:15:21
13	not have been previously selected at all during	13:15:24
14	the entire time period T?	13:15:27
15	MR. MARTINELLI: Objection. Form.	13:15:30
16	THE WITNESS: That once again, that is	13:15:31
17	my understanding of what F represents, what F	13:15:39
18	stands for. And that's our claim that's what	13:15:43
19	we have submitted as my claim construction.	13:15:46
20	Q So let me let me try this on let me	13:15:51
21	try to ask this in another way.	13:15:55
22	Did the patentee define F to be such that	13:15:57
23	the that a frequency can only be used once	13:16:05
24	during the entirety of time period T?	13:16:11
25	A Does the patentee define it though in	13:16:17

		i
1	plain language? The answer is no. Does the	13:16:22
2	patent, together with the with the response to	13:16:25
3	notice of rejection explain that? Yes.	13:16:31
4	The patentee explicitly stated that over	13:16:34
5	the period of T, a previously selected frequency	13:16:37
6	would not be will be subsequently prohibited,	13:16:44
7	will be subsequently prohibited from being	13:16:49
8	selected again.	13:16:53
9	So in that context, if you look at the	13:16:54
10	definition of two sets, the bigger set with a set	13:16:57
11	of frequencies and the smaller set which is	13:17:00
12	allowable frequency, one with as a person of	13:17:03
13	skill in art would naturally conclude that F is as	13:17:06
14	we construed here in paragraph 69.	13:17:10
15	Q Okay. Dr. Ding, what what's how do	13:17:15
16	you define random or randomly?	13:17:21
17	A How do we define randomly? Yes. That's a	13:17:25
18	very it's a it's a physical and mathematical	13:17:30
19	question. So random would mean that you need	13:17:35
20	to you need to make certain that the numbers	13:17:42
21	when the sequence of numbers, okay, would	13:17:48
22	satisfy certain statistical property.	13:17:51
23	The statistical property, for example,	13:17:56
24	would show very weak correlation or no correlation	13 <b>:</b> 17 <b>:</b> 58
25	between successive numbers or or even not just	13:18:02

1	one right next to another, adjacent number, but	13:18:07
2	multiple numbers.	13:18:10
3	For example, Number 1 and Number 7 and	13:18:12
4	Number 14 and so forth, these numbers should not	13:18:15
5	exhibit certain correlation or strong correlation.	13:18:22
6	So in the sense it needs to be statistically	13:18:24
7	independent. That's random. So there are	13:18:28
8	statistical tests that would allow you to	13:18:31
9	determine whether a particular number's sequence	13:18:35
10	is random or not.	13:18:40
11	Q So if you had to construe the term random,	13:18:44
12	how would you propose a construction?	13:18:49
13	MR. MARTINELLI: Objection. Outside the	13:18:51
14	scope.	13:18:53
15	THE WITNESS: I would not construe random	13:18:54
16	because random is mathematically well-defined.	13:18:57
17	Q So you would never pose a construction for	13:19:03
18	the word random?	13:19:07
19	MR. MARTINELLI: Objection.	13:19:08
20	THE WITNESS: That's not my that's not	13:19:09
21	what I'm explaining. I'm saying that if someone	13:19:10
22	just talk about random, we know exactly what it	13:19:12
23	means statistically and mathematically, right,	13:19:18
24	Mr. Stern.	13:19:23
25	But if you are if you me put if you	13:19:24

1	put me on the spot to explain what is random or	13:19:26
2	perform a claim construction of random, I would	13:19:31
3	have to look at what exactly this patent claims	13:19:34
4	are about and may potentially the patentee we're	13:19:38
5	talking about almost random, or not exactly random	13:19:43
6	or pseudorandom. So it is not possible for me to	13:19:47
7	know.	13:19:52
8	But if we want to be mathematically and	13:19:53
9	physically rigorous, we go to statistics. There	13:19:57
10	are many books that would have a much clearer and	13:19:59
11	complete, full definition about what would be a	13:20:02
12	random sequence. I think we can do a better job	13:20:05
13	than I can. That's what I'm opining on. I'm not	13:20:13
14	saying I wouldn't do it. I can just recite what	13:20:14
15	is mathematically accurate.	13:20:17
16	Q Sure. So what I'm correct me if I'm	13:20:18
17	wrong, but I'm just trying to understand what your	13:20:23
18	testimony is. And you can strike that preamble.	13:20:28
19	It's your opinion that a POSA outside of	13:20:34
20	the outside of looking at the '346 patent would	13:20:39
21	not need to construe it in order to understand	13:20:44
22	what what that term means?	13:20:47
23	MR. MARTINELLI: Objection. Form.	13:20:50
24	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, construe what?	13:20:51
25	Random?	13:20:54

1	Q Correct.	13:20:54
2	A Hypothetically first of all,	13:20:55
3	hypothetically, I we're not I'm not	13:20:57
4	construing random. We're I'm talking about	13:21:00
5	pseudorandom. These are completely different	13:21:04
6	terms.	13:21:06
7	And what my opinion is that I can	13:21:07
8	construe I can help construct construct	13:21:11
9	the construction of random if if I'm asked to	13:21:14
10	do that. I have not done that analysis yet. But	13:21:20
11	hypothetically, I certainly could. I can do so in	13:21:23
12	such a way that it is entirely consistent with the	13:21:27
13	mathematical and statistical definition of random	13:21:31
14	numbers. I can absolutely do that.	13:21:35
15	Q But a person a person with a bachelor's	13:21:41
16	degree in electrical engineering or computer	13:21:47
17	science and has three to four years of practical	13:21:50
18	work or research experience in the wireless	13:21:53
19	communication field would understand what the term	13:22:00
20	random means without redefining it, correct?	13:22:03
21	A They they will have some idea about	13:22:08
22	what random means. Exactly how to there's a	13:22:11
23	difference again. I would emphasize, Mr. Stern,	13:22:17
24	we're not talking random. We're talking about	13:22:21
25	pseudorandom, in my opinion. And I don't	13:22:24

1	understand why you insist on asking me to construe	13:22:26
2	or not construe random.	13:22:30
3	If you have if you would like to focus	13:22:32
4	on my declaration, where we're discussing	13:22:34
5	pseudorandom, I'll be more than happy to. But I'm	13:22:38
6	just I feel uncomfortable when you insist on me	13:22:42
7	playing the role of statistician or think what a	13:22:45
8	POSITA would have would have taken the risk of	13:22:49
9	miss of just defining or using their only	13:22:53
10	interpretation of what random really means.	13:22:56
11	I mean, random is literally mathematically	13:22:59
12	defined defined by mathematicians and	13:23:03
13	statisticians. I don't understand why are we even	13:23:08
14	discussing that because that's not part of my	13:23:11
15	opinion.	13:23:13
16	Q Are are you a mathematician or a	13:23:14
17	statistician by training?	13:23:18
18	A I am not. I use a lot of mathematics,	13:23:20
19	perhaps more so than my friends in the legal	13:23:27
20	field. I use a lot of statistics, perhaps more so	13:23:29
21	than my legal friend, lawyer friends, and people	13:23:32
22	in other fields of engineering. So I have a	13:23:35
23	fair fairly good understanding of statistics	13:23:43
24	and mathematics.	13:23:45
25	Q But you don't want to put yourself out as	13:23:49

1	^	$\sim$
- 1	11	u
1	v	フ

1	someone of enough skill to offer a construction of	13:23:52
2	the term random; is that fair?	13:23:58
3	A No. That's not totally what I'm saying.	13:24:01
4	The point is I I'm not I'm a scholar. I	13:24:04
5	don't want to offer opinions that are, you know,	13:24:09
6	academically wrong. So when we are just when a	13:24:14
7	person as you have just come and say, tell me what	13:24:18
8	random means, okay, which is entirely out of	13:24:22
9	context of this particular proceeding, I will say,	13:24:25
10	well, look it up. The mathematicians have done a	13:24:28
11	better job defining it, but it's it's got to	13:24:33
12	meet certain statistical properties.	13:24:35
13	And I'm just not willing to say how	13:24:38
14	what those random means in fear of missing one or	13:24:41
15	two properties. I just don't want to be	13:24:44
16	incomplete. I'm not trying to resist temptation	13:24:48
17	of defining it. I have pretty good confidence	13:24:52
18	that I might be able to capture it well.	13:24:55
19	But sitting here today, right now, you	13:24:59
20	want me to list all the properties. I'm afraid	13:25:01
21	I'm unable to do that. I like I said to you, I	13:25:04
22	didn't perform this analysis.	13:25:06
23	Q Understood. Thank you, Dr. Ding, for your	13:25:08
24	candor.	13:25:12
25	Okay. What's your understanding of the	13:25:13

1	CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER-NOTARY PUBLIC
2	I, Karisa Ekenseair, the officer before
3	whom the foregoing deposition was taken, do hereby
4	certify that the foregoing transcript is a true
5	and correct record of the testimony given; that
6	said testimony was taken by me stenographically
7	and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my
8	direction; that reading and signing was not
9	requested; and that I am neither counsel for,
10	related to, nor employed by any of the parties to
11	this case and have no interest, financial or
12	otherwise, in its outcome.
13	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
14	hand and affixed my notarial seal this 12th day of
15	October, 2021.
16	My commission expires: 6-18-2028
17	K II O
18	Kaur III-
19	Karisa Ekenseair, CCR, RPR LS #802
20	Notary Public in and for
21	Pulaski County, Arkansas
22	Commission No. 12704567
23	
24	
25	